PM/93-34
UTS-DFT-93-28

Four Fermion Processes at Future e^+e^- Colliders as a Probe of New Resonant Structures

J. Layssac, F.M. Renard
Physique Mathématique et Théorique,
CNRS-URA 768, Université Montpellier II
F-34095 Montpellier Cedex 5

C. Verzegnassi
Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Trieste
Strada Costiera, 11 Miramare, I-34014 Trieste,
and INFN, Sezione di Trieste, Italy

Abstract

Possible oblique effects from vector particles that are strongly coupled to the known gauge bosons are calculated for the case of final hadronic states produced at future e^+e^- colliders, using a formalism that was recently proposed and that exploits the information and the constraints provided by LEP 1 results. Combining the hadronic channels with the previously analysed leptonic ones we derive improved limits for the masses of the resonances that, in technicolour-like cases, would range from one to two TeV for a 500 GeV linear collider, depending on the assumed theoretical constraints.

The possibility of using high precision LEP1 data to derive information, or to set stringent bounds, on technicolour models, has been thoroughly investigated in recent times, following the original proposal of Peskin and Takeuchi [1]. As it is known, the relevant effect is a virtual one-loop contribution, of the so-called [2] oblique type, to the quantity defined S in ref.[1].

Technically speaking, the calculation of S is made easier by the fact that the combination of spectral functions that is involved has a rather exceptional asymptotic convergence, being the difference of a vector and an axial vector term, and this allows the use of simple dispersion relations i.e. without unknown extra subtraction constants. This nice feature would not be present in general in different kinematical configurations, e.g. away from the Z resonance, for other oblique corrections of similar type, and an analogous calculation of technicolour-like effects would require some extra ingredient or ad hoc assumptions that might bias the theoretical outcome.

In a recent publication [3] we actually proposed a general formalism to calculate the relevant oblique contributions to a number of processes in future higher energies e^+e^- experiments. The main idea was that of expressing the various effects in the form of a once-subtracted dispersion integral, and of fixing the necessary subtraction constants by suitable model-independent LEP 1 results. In this way, we were led to a compact "representation" of several observables. In particular, we concentrated our preliminary analysis on the case of final leptonic states and more precisely on the three quantities:

a) the cross section for muon production at cm energy $\sqrt{q^2}$, $\sigma_\mu(q^2)$.

b) the related forward-backward asymmetry $A_{FB,\mu}(q^2)$

c) the (conventionally defined) final τ polarization asymmetry $A_\tau(q^2)$ or, equivalently, the longitudinal polarization asymmetry for final <u>lepton</u> production $A_{LR,l}(q^2)$ whose theoretical expressions coincide in our scheme.

Starting from the tree-level expressions of (a), (b), (c) and making use of the by now

conventional formalism based on the introduction of the two parameters $\epsilon_{1,3}$, that allows to interpret LEP 1 leptonic data in a model-independent way [4], we were able to write for the oblique (S.E.= self-energy) corrections the following approximate formulae, valid at the one loop level:

$$\sigma_\mu^{SE}(q^2) = \frac{4\pi q^2}{3}\left\{ [\frac{\alpha(M_Z^2)}{q^2}]^2[1+2D_\gamma(q^2)] + \frac{1}{(q^2-M_Z^2)^2+M_Z^2\Gamma_Z^2} \right.$$
$$\left. [\ \frac{3\Gamma_l}{M_Z}\ ]^2\ [1-2D_Z(q^2) - \frac{16 s_1^2 v_1}{1-v_1^2} D_{\gamma Z(q^2)}] \right\} \quad (1)$$

$$A_{FB,\mu}^{S.E.}(q^2) = \frac{3}{4}[\frac{3q^2\sigma_\mu(q^2)}{4\pi}]^{-1}\left\{ 6\alpha(M_Z^2)\frac{\Gamma_l}{M_Z}\frac{q^2(q^2-M_Z^2)}{(q^2-M_Z^2)^2+M_Z^2\Gamma_Z^2} \right.$$
$$\left. [1+D_\gamma(q^2)-D_Z(q^2)]\ ] \right\} \quad (2)$$

$$A_\tau^{(S.E.)}(q^2) \equiv A_{LR,l}^{(S.E.)} = [\ \frac{3q^2\sigma_\mu(q^2)}{4\pi}\ ]^{-1}\ A(M_Z^2)\left\{ [6\alpha(M_Z^2)\frac{\Gamma_l}{M_Z}\frac{q^2(q^2-M_Z^2)}{(q^2-M_Z^2)^2+M_Z^2\Gamma_Z^2} \right.$$
$$\left. +18(\frac{\Gamma_l}{M_Z})^2\frac{q^4}{(q^2-M_Z^2)^2+M_Z^2\Gamma_Z^2}] \times [1-\frac{8s_1^2}{A(M_Z^2)}D_{\gamma Z}(q^2)]\ ] \right\} \quad (3)$$

Here Γ_l is the leptonic Z width, $\alpha(M_Z^2) = [1 \pm 0.001]/128.87$[5], $A(M_Z^2)$ is defined as

$$A(M_Z^2) \equiv \frac{2(1-4s_{EFF}^2(M_Z^2))}{1+(1-4s_{EFF}^2(M_Z^2))^2} \quad (4)$$

with $s_{EFF}^2(M_Z^2)$ measured by the various asymmetries at LEP 1 and SLC, and

$$D_\gamma(q^2) \equiv \Delta\alpha(q^2) - \Delta\alpha(M_Z^2) = -\frac{q^2-M_Z^2}{\pi}\ \mathcal{P}\int_0^\infty \frac{ds\ Im\ F_\gamma(s)}{(s-q^2)(s-M_Z^2)} \quad (5)$$

$$D_Z(q^2) \equiv Re\ [I_Z(q^2) - I_Z(M_Z^2)] = \frac{q^2-M_Z^2}{\pi}\ \mathcal{P}\int_0^\infty \frac{ds\ s\ Im\ F_{ZZ}(s)}{(s-q^2)(s-M_Z^2)^2} \quad (6)$$

$$D_{\gamma Z}(q^2) \equiv Re\ [\Delta\bar{\kappa}'(q^2) - \Delta\bar{\kappa}'(M_Z^2)] = \frac{q^2-M_Z^2}{\pi}\ \mathcal{P}\int_0^\infty \frac{ds\ Im\ F_{\kappa'}(s)}{(s-q^2)(s-M_Z^2)} \quad (7)$$

$$(F'_\kappa = c_1/s_1\ F_{Z\gamma}, s_1^2 c_1^2 = \frac{\pi\alpha}{\sqrt{2}G_\mu M_Z^2} \quad , \quad s_1^2 = 1-c_1^2 \simeq 0.217 \quad , \quad v_1 = 1-4s_1^2).$$

Eqs.(1),(2),(3) provide a representation of the leptonic observables of e^+e^- annihilation where the full effect of the oblique corrections is made explicit in the form of a subtracted dispersion relation, thus calculable for models of both perturbative and of non- perturbative type, with the subtraction constants provided by model-independent LEP 1 data. Note that, to obtain properly gauge-invariant expressions, one has still to add the correct amount of extra vertices and boxes[6], as discussed in ref.[3], to compensate for the intrinsically not gauge-invariant nature of the transverse self-energies, that are defined following the convention:

$$A_{ij}(q^2) \equiv A_{ij}(0) + q^2 F_{ij}(q^2) \quad , \; i,j = \gamma, Z \; . \tag{8}$$

Starting from eqs.(1)-(3) and (5)-(7) we calculated in ref.[3] the possible effects of a couple of vector (V) and axial vector (A) resonances with masses larger than $\sqrt{q^2}$, strongly coupled to the photon and to the Z. We assumed a "technicolour-like" framework but only exploited the validity of the <u>second</u> Weinberg sum rule [7]. We did not use the model-dependent information provided by the first Weinberg sum rule. However, we retained one very general consequence of it, i.e. the positivity of S, which was ensured by the choice $M_A > M_V$. Taking into account the LEP 1 constraint [8] on the S-parameter, we derived observability limits for $M_{V,A}$ in the TeV range for a realistic e^+e^- linear collider of 500 GeV cm energy [9]. This was an encouraging preliminary result, particularly since only the final leptonic channels were fully exploited.

This short paper has two purposes. The first one is that of enlarging the previous study by including the potentially copious information provided by the analysis of final hadronic states. The second one is that of emphasizing the relevance of some special theoretical assumptions to fix the derived mass limits, in particular of investigating the consequences of relaxing completely the two Weinberg sum rules, while still retaining the experimental constraint provided by the LEP 1 limits on the S parameter.

The investigation of the hadronic channels can be easily performed following the pre-

scriptions of ref.[3]. We shall briefly sketch here the derivation of the relevant formulae for the "basic" cases of the two cross sections for production of u-type and d-type quarks, $\sigma_{u,d}(q^2)$. With this purpose, we start from the expressions of these quantities at tree level:

$$\sigma^{(0)}_{u,d}(q^2) = N^{(0)}_{u,d}\ \ [\ \frac{4}{3}\pi q^2\ ]\{(\ \frac{Q_{u,d}\alpha_0}{q^2}\ )^2 + [\ \frac{G^0_\mu\sqrt{2}M^2_{0Z}}{16\pi}]^2\times$$

$$\times\ \frac{16[(g^0_{V,u,d})^2+(g^0_{A,u,d})][(g^0_{V,l})^2+(g^0_{A,l})]}{D^2_{0Z}}] - 2Q_{u,d}\frac{\alpha_0 G^0_\mu\sqrt{2}M^2_{0Z}}{16\pi q^2}4g^0_{V,l}g^0_{V,u,d}Re\ \frac{1}{D_{0Z}}\ \} \quad (9)$$

where $N_{u,d}$ is the colour factor, $g_{V,A,f}$ are conventionally defined, i.e. $g_{A_0,f} = T_{3L,f}$ and $g_{V0,f} = T_{3L,f} - 2Q_f s^2_0$, $G_{\mu 0}$ is the (bare) Fermi muon decay coupling and $D_{0Z} = q^2 - M^2_{0Z}$ (the tree level equality $\alpha_0/s^2_0c^2_0 = \sqrt{2}/\pi\ G_{\mu 0}M^2_{0Z}$ has been used).

When moving to one loop, one has to redefine the Fermi coupling, the QED coupling, the bare mass M_Z, the photon and Z propagators and the various fermion couplings $g_{V,A,f}$. Then, vertex corrections and boxes should be correctly included. For the specific purposes of this paper, that is only dealing with oblique corrections, these terms will not be explicitely calculated. Thus, in the redefinition of the Fermi coupling, only the oblique content $A_{WW}(0)/M^2_W$ will be retained. Analogously,for the vector couplings we shall stick to the notations of a previous paper [10] and write, following essentially the Kennedy and Lynn approach [11]

$$\frac{g_{V,f}}{g_{A,f}} = 1 - 4|Q_f|^2 s^2_f(q^2) \qquad \text{with} \qquad s^2_f(q^2) = s^2_1[1+\Delta\bar{\kappa}'_f(q^2)] \quad (10)$$

The quantity $\Delta\bar{\kappa}'_f(q^2)$ can be decomposed into a universal self-energy component $\Delta\bar{\kappa}'$ and a (light) fermion dependent vertex correction i.e.(omitting boxes)

$$\Delta\bar{\kappa}'_f(q^2) = \Delta\bar{\kappa}'(q^2) + \delta'_f \quad (11)$$

with δ'_f (to be from now on neglected) defined in ref.[10] and $\Delta\bar{\kappa}'(q^2)$ fixed by the convention

$$s^2_{EFF}(M^2_Z) = s^2_1[1+\Delta\bar{\kappa}'(M^2_Z)+\delta'_l] \quad (12)$$

The procedure for deriving compact expressions for the various self-energy contributions at one loop now follows essentially the same lines as in the case of ref.[3]. In fact, the pure photon contribution will generate the usual term $\simeq D_\gamma(q^2)$. From the Z contribution, using the definition[4]

$$\Gamma_l = \frac{G_\mu M_Z^3}{24\pi\sqrt{2}}[1+\epsilon_1][1+(1-4s^2_{EFF}(M_Z^2))^2] \tag{13}$$

$$\text{with} \qquad \epsilon_1 \equiv -\frac{A_{WW}(0)}{M_W^2} + \frac{A_{ZZ}(0)}{M_Z^2} + \text{vertices ...} \tag{14}$$

an expression containing Γ_l, $D_Z(q^2)$, $D_{\gamma Z}(q^2)$ and $s^2_{EFF}(M_Z^2)$ will be originated. Finally, from the $\gamma - Z$ interference, a combination of the previous pure photon and pure Z case parameters will appear. In practice, the main difference between the self-energy content of $\sigma_{u,d}$ and that of σ_μ will come from the relative weights of the various $D_\gamma,\ D_Z,\ D_{\gamma Z}$ contributions, due to the various electric charges Q_f that enter both as coefficients of α and as coefficients of g_V/g_A in eq.(11).

With these premises, it becomes relatively simple to derive the explicit expressions of the desired one-loop contributions to $\sigma_{u,d}$. Neglecting systematically numerically irrelevant contributions , one obtains the following simple formulae ($\sigma_f^{(1)}$ denotes the quantity at one loop):

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^{(1)}_{u,d} \;=\; & N_u^{(1)}\ [\,\frac{4}{3}\pi q^2\,]\Big\{\ Q^2_{u,d}[\frac{\alpha(M_Z^2)}{q^2}]^2[1+2D_\gamma(q^2)] + \\
& + \frac{1}{(q^2-M_Z^2)^2+M_Z^2\Gamma_Z^2}\ [\ \frac{3\Gamma_l}{M_Z}\ ]^2\ [1+v^2_{u,d1}][1-2D_Z(q^2)] - 2Q_{u,d}\alpha(M_Z^2)\times \\
& \times\frac{3\Gamma_l}{M_Z}\frac{[q^2-M_Z^2]}{q^2}\frac{1}{(q^2-M_Z^2)^2+M_Z^2\Gamma_Z^2}v_{u,d,1}v_1[1-(\frac{4s_1^2}{v_1}+4|Qu,d|\frac{s_1^2}{v_{u,d1}})D_{\gamma Z}(q^2)]\ \Big\}
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $N_f^{(1)}$ is the colour QCD corrected factor and we used the generalized notation:

$$v_{f1} \equiv 1-4|Q_f|s_1^2 \quad ; \quad f=u,d \tag{16}$$

(and $v_{l1} \equiv v_1$). Starting from the "basic" quantities eq.(17) it is now straightforward to derive the corresponding expressions of a certain number of hadronic observables. We

have considered here the theoretical expressions of the following "candidates" to reveal potential self-energy effects:

I) $R^{(5)}(q^2)$, the ratio $\sigma^{(5)(q^2)}/\sigma_\mu(q^2)$ between the cross sections for production of the five lighter (u, d, s, c, b) quarks and for muon production

II) $A^{(5)}_{LR}(q^2)$, the longitudinal polarization asymmetry for final hadronic states of the previous type

III) $R_{b,\mu}(q^2)$, the ratio $\sigma_b(q^2)/\sigma_\mu(q^2)$ between b-quark and muon production

IV) $A_{FB,b}(q^2)$, the forward-backward asymmetry for b quark production. In addition to the previous "old-fashioned" quantities we have also calculated, assuming a (copious) top production at $\sqrt{q^2} = 500\ GeV$, the theoretical expression of a number of related observables. In particular, we have considered here:

V) $R^{(6)}(q^2)$, $A^{(6)}_{LR}(q^2)$, $R_{t,\mu}(q^2)$ defined in analogy with (I), (II), (III).

VI) $R^{(5),(6)}_{b,t}(q^2)$, (the ratios $\sigma_{b,t}(q^2)/\sigma^{(5),(6)}(q^2)$) and $A_{FB,t}(q^2)$

For all the previous observables from (I) to (VI), it is not difficult to write the expressions at one loop that generalize those of ref.[3]. But,in the actual process of doing that, one easily realizes that a priori not all cases seem equally promising. In particular, assuming "realistic" experimental accuracies (i.e. of the kind discussed in previous analyses[9]) for the various cross sections and their ratios, it turns out that the weights of the various $D_\gamma, D_Z, D_{\gamma,Z}$ contributions (that are rather different in the various observables) are systematically "small" in the cases (IV)-(VI), leading to practically unobservable effects. For this reason, we concentrated our attention on the quantities (I)-(III) only. Ignoring as usually several irrelevant terms, we were led in conclusion to the following set of expressions that include the full effect of the oblique corrections at one loop:

$$R^{(5)(S.E.)}(q^2) = a_0[1 + a_\gamma D_\gamma + a_Z D_Z + a_{\gamma Z} D_{\gamma Z}] \tag{17}$$

$$R_{b,\mu}^{(S.E.)}(q^2) = b_0[1 + b_\gamma D_\gamma + b_Z D_Z + b_{\gamma Z} D_{\gamma Z}] \tag{18}$$

$$A_{LR}^{(5)(S.E.)}(q^2) = c_0[1 + c_\gamma D_\gamma + c_Z D_Z + c_{\gamma Z} D_{\gamma Z}] \tag{19}$$

where the analytic expressions of the various coefficients can be derived in a straightforward way and their numerical values for $\sqrt{q^2} = 500(190) GeV$ are given below:

$a_0 = 5.59(6.84)$, $a_\gamma = -0.61(-0.76)$, $a_Z = -0.84(-1.12)$, $a_{\gamma Z} = -0.26(-0.32)$

$b_0 = 0.88(1.16)$, $b_\gamma = -1.10(-1.17)$, $b_Z = -1.21(-1.41)$, $b_{\gamma Z} = -0.80(-0.78)$

$c_0 = 0.61$, $c_\gamma = -0.42$, $c_Z = -0.27$, $c_{\gamma Z} = -1.78$

(we only considered the case for $A_{LR}^{(5)(S.E.)}(q^2)$ at a 500 GeV linear collider)

Starting from the previous expressions eqs.(17)-(19) it is now straightforward to calculate various kinds of contributions of self-energy type, in particular that coming from a model that implies the existence of a couple of strongly coupled vector (V) and axial vector (A) resonances. For the latter ones we shall follow the same notations as in ref.[3], adopting the simplest treatment based on a delta-function approximation (but keeping in mind the discussion given there on the possibility of using a more realistic description without changing the essential results i.e. the mass limits). We shall not abandon at this stage the customary assumption of isospin and parity conservation. Thus, the imaginary parts of the various spectral functions will simply be expressed in terms of the two quantities R_{VV}, R_{AA} with

$$R_{VV,AA} = 12\pi^2 F_{V,A}^2 \delta(s - M_{V,A}) \tag{20}$$

Our investigation now proceeds in two steps. First, we assumed as we did in Ref.[3] the validity of the two Weinberg sum rules (but only fully exploited the consequences of the second one) and we made use of the experimental constraint on the parameter S ,that can be written to quite reasonable an approximation as:

$$-1.5 \leq \; S \; \leq 0.5 \tag{21}$$

only considering the positive upper bound. Then we combined the previous ansatzs with the request that the experimental accuracies on $R^{(5)}$, $A_{LR}^{(5)}$ and $R_{b,\mu}$ are of a relative one,one and two percent respectively [9] and imposed the consequent "observability" limits.

Fig(1) shows the results of our analysis for the case $\sqrt{q^2} = 500\ GeV$. The different curves correspond to the various observables, and the shaded area corresponds to the combined overall mass bound.

From inspection of Fig.(1),the following main conclusions may be derived:

a) the only hadronic observable which contributes appreciably the bound is A_{LR}^{h}, that allows to improve the pure leptonic result by approximately 150 GeV.

b) the resulting bounds on M_V, M_A are located in the TeV range, and rather strongly correlated. For the QCD-like choice $M_A/M_V = 1.6$, values of M_V up to 1 GeV would be seen.

In the previous analysis, several theoretical assumptions (or prejudices ?) were inforced, on which the obtained bounds certainly depend. To try to make the interconnection between the numerical output and the theoretical input more quantitatively defined might be an interesting goal. With this aim, we considered the consequences of abandoning some of the starting ingredients of our approach. Since we would personally feel uneasy in giving up the familiar isospin and parity conservation philosophy, we began by rather eliminating the assumptions of validity of both Weinberg sum rules and only retained a "minimal" convergence assumption $(F_{VV}(q^2) - F_{AA}(q^2)) \sim 0, q^2 \to \infty$, to ensure the unsubtracted form of S. This choice has two main consequences, that of introducing another degree of freedom in the analysis and that of allowing the Peskin-Takeuchi parameter S to become negative, since one has now

$$S = \left[\frac{F_V^2}{M_V^2} - \frac{F_A^2}{M_A^2} \right] \tag{22}$$

with no special indications for its sign. Thus, the experimental constraint for S, eq.(42), will now allow both end points of the allowed interval to be saturated.

In performing our numerical analysis, we had to solve the problem of the presence of one additional degree of freedom. We decided to proceed by retaining a "prejudice relic" in which the value of the ratio F_V/M_V was bounded by the limit

$$\frac{F_V}{M_V} = 2\frac{f_\rho}{m_\rho} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \tag{23}$$

i.e. twice the QCD value. Higher values of the ratio would obviously increase the mass bounds accordingly, as from eq.(31). Then , for every choice of F_V^2/M_V^2, F_A^2/M_A^2 was allowed to saturate both limits of eqs.(42). The final results were then plotted as in the case of Fig.(1) in the (M_V, M_A) plane. In Fig.(2) we give the results of the procedure that correspond to the choice $F_V^2/M_V^2 = 1/2\pi$, showing that the situation has now definitely changed with respect to Fig.(1). In particular, one sees now that the effect of releasing the validity of the Weinberg sum rules is roughly that of increasing the bounds on (M_V, M_A) from the 1 TeV region to the 2 TeV region for a reasonable limitation on F_V/M_V. The effect of the hadronic observables is still to increase the mass bounds by about 150 GeV.

To complete our analysis, we examined the similar sitation that would occur at $\sqrt{q^2} = 190\ GeV$, i.e. the near future LEP2 energy. We proceeded as before with the experimental conditions expected by previous analyses [12]. The results that we obtained are shown in Fig.(3) . As one sees LEP2 under realistic experimental conditions would be able to reveal signals of strong resonances whose masses range up to 300-350 GeV (assuming the Weinberg sum rules) or to 400-450 GeV (releasing them). These values appear relatively low in classical TC pictures [13],but would certainly be much more interesting in non orthodox TC versions more recently suggested [14] implying the existence of 'light" strongly resonant states.

In conclusion, and although our investigation was relatively qualitative, we feel that its indications should be considered as an example of the potential interest of such measurements at future e^+e^- colliders.

References

[1] M.E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 381 (1991) .

[2] B.W. Lynn, M.E. Peskin and R. Stuart in "Physics at LEP", J. Ellis and R. Peccei eds., CERN 86-02 (1986), Vol 1.

[3] J. Layssac, F.M. Renard and C. Verzegnassi, Phys. Rev. **D48**, 4037 (1993) .

[4] G. Altarelli, R. Barbieri and S. Jadach, Nucl. Phys. **B369**, 3 (1992) .

[5] H. Burkhard, F. Jegerlehner, G. Penso and C. Verzegnassi, Z. Phys. **C43**, 497 (1988)

[6] G. Degrassi and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 3104 (1992) , for the original proposal see also J.M. Cornwall, Phys. Rev. **D26**, 1453 (1982) .

[7] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18**, 507 (1967) .

[8] See e.g. the talk given by G.Altarelli at the Marseilles Conference, July 1993.

[9] See e.g.: e^+e^- collisions at 500 GeV: the Physics Potential", DESY 92-123-1992, edited by P.M. Zerwas.

[10] J. Layssac, F.M. Renard and C. Verzegnassi, preprint UCLA/93/TEP/16, to appear in Phys.Rev. D.

[11] D.C. Kennedy and B.W. Lynn, Nucl. Phys. **B322**, 1 (1989) .

[12] A. Blondel, F.M. Renard, P. Taxil and C. Verzegnassi, Nucl. Phys. **B331**, 293 (1990) .

[13] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D13**, 974 (1976) , **D19** (1979) 1277; L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. **D20**, 2619 (1979) ; E. Fahri and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. **D20**, 3404 (1979) .

[14] R.S. Chivukula, M.J. Dugan and M. Golden, Phys. Lett. **B292**, 435 (1992) .

Figure Captions

Fig.1 Limits on M_A at variable M_V obtained at $\sqrt{q^2} = 500\ GeV$ from σ_μ (dotted), $A_{LR,h}$ (dot-dashed) and A_τ (dashed), using the Weinberg sum rules and the experimental information on S. The lighter shaded domain represents the result of combining quadratically the two leptonic limits. The darker one corresponds to the domain allowed by the leptonic and the hadronic limits. The two full lines correspond to $M_A = 1.6 M_V$ and to $M_A = 1.1 M_V$.

Fig.2 Limits when releasing the Weinberg sum rules but imposing the limitation on F_V/M_V, from σ_μ (vertical,dotted), A_τ (vertical, dashed), $A_{LR,h}$ (dot-dashed), $R_{b,\mu}$ (short dashed), $R^{(5)}$ (dotted), $A_{FB,\mu}$ (long dashed). The shaded domains have the same meaning as in Fig.1. The two full lines now correspond to $M_A = 1.6 M_V$ and to $M_A = M_V$.

Fig.3 Resulting domains obtained at $\sqrt{q^2} = 190\ GeV$ (same meaning as in Fig.2) with accuracies expected at LEP2.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9310367v1